

SERVICE DELIVERY REFORM COMMITTEE MEETING NOTES

Holiday Inn
Sacramento, CA
November 16, 1999

INTRODUCTORY REMARKS:

- Following introductions, the goals for the meeting and an explanation of the packet materials were presented. Members were informed that the committee has two major service reform issues: stabilizing the system, as well as, system reform. Although the current system has to be on hold during this three to five-year reform process, the law does not indicate that rates have to be frozen until the end of this time frame. However, it would need Legislative action to appropriate additional monies into the system for increased rates. As the Committee goes into the second stage of service reform, with the principles and outcomes statements nearly complete, development of the indicators, strategies and performance measures is the next step. This is the most difficult and time consuming stage and it is critical that the five workgroups attain a common understanding of how outcomes, strategies, and performance measurement concepts are developed.

FRAMEWORK FOR REFORM AND TIME LINES

- Delivering the report to the Legislature by April 1 is not a legislative mandate since SB 1104 was vetoed. There was consensus from Committee members that meeting this deadline is still extremely important and that every effort should be made to meet that goal. Additionally, the Committee was reminded that budget process time line coincides favorably with this April 1 deadline. Members were assured that revisions to the report can be made and Committee consensus obtained after it is presented to the Legislature. There was agreement that a "disclaimer" would be incorporated in the Legislative Report to convey that the report reflects the status of current system reform process, but does not necessarily reflect a final consensus of the Committee on all service reform components.
- After completion and presentation of the basic framework to the Legislature, future steps and time lines include:
 - The next fiscal year will be spent primarily refining and revising the report. The Department will solicit help and advice from national experts in this effort.
 - Work towards obtaining consensus of all of the components of the report.
 - Conduct some pilot testing of some of the things outlined in the report.
 - Get people ready for full implementation in the fifth year.

- A Table of Contents containing the basic structure of the Report to the Legislature was reviewed. With the values and principles and outcomes documents nearing completion, the indicators, strategies, and performance measures are now in the development process. A draft of these documents will be presented at the January meeting in Burbank. Revisions will then be made based on the input at this meeting and presented again in March. Any additional revisions from the March SDRC meeting will be completed before it is presented to the Legislature.

FURTHER DISCUSSION OF RATE ISSUES:

- Concerns were expressed by some committee members over the SB1104 veto message and the urgent need for an infusion of a significant amount of money into the system, both now and over the three to five-year service reform period. It was felt that without this infusion of money, the system would not be stable enough for reform.
- Some members pointed out that while rate reform is critical, there are other service delivery issues that need to be addressed, such as, the lack of crisis centers in the community and licensing reforms.
- Another concern expressed was the need to reform the Intermediate Care Facility (ICF) rate structure, inasmuch as ICF rates impact the care of a significant number of consumers. It was pointed out that while this issue is under the authority of the Department of Health Services, it was likely that if rate increases take place under our system reform effort, the ICF rates would follow in that direction also. The ICF issue was referred to the Residential Workgroup.

PERSONAL OUTCOMES DOCUMENT AND GLOSSARY OF TERMS:

- The Glossary of Terms document was presented as a dictionary of common language that will be used in the Legislative Report.
- Personal Outcomes Document discussion and revisions:
 - A “*Development*” component was added by the Early Start Workgroup due to its importance for children under the age of three.
 - The Committee adopted the recommendations of the Supported Living Workgroup to change the wording under Item 9 and to add an additional item under the “Choice” outcomes:

Item 9 to read “People are part of ~~their identified~~ the mainstream of community life and live, work and/or play and carry out daily activities in natural, integrated community and home environments.

The additional item under the “Choice” outcomes should incorporate “People have a method of expressing preference and a method of acting on those preferences in all areas of life. Preferences can be expressed in nonverbal ways.”

- It was suggested that wording under Item 4 be changed to “People have a leading role in choosing...rather than *major* role. It was pointed out that the Lanterman Act grants the regional center the right to select the provider of services, but in making that selection, they must take into consideration who the family wants as a provider, along with other considerations. This issue was referred to Carol Risley to prepare a recommendation for the next meeting.
- Item 6 - the word “language” will replace the word “linguistic.”
- Item 20 - the phrase “best possible health” will be changed to “best health possible.”
- The Personal Outcomes document will go to each workgroup for adoption prior to the next Committee meeting.

WORKGROUP REPORTS AND RECOMMENDATIONS:

- The following workgroup reports and recommendations were presented to the Committee:
 - **Early Start Workgroup** by Cherie Schoenborn:
A public forum was held by this workgroup to provide an update on service delivery. There were over 200 people in attendance, and the workgroup received some good input. Action items will be submitted by this workgroup at the next Committee meeting.
 - **Supported Living Service Workgroup** by Julia Mullen. The Action Items recommended by this workgroup were reviewed and discussed as follows:

There was concern expressed under Item 1 that the phrase “affordable and accessible housing” would be interpreted as congregant housing which could allow a housing complex to be 100% occupied by people with disabilities, excluding them from being fully integrated into the community. The Committee was cautioned that in using Federal money to develop affordable housing, e.g., a 20-unit apartment complex, if only 50% of the occupants could be disabled, you would actually be denying significant numbers of disabled people from integrating into the community.

Items 1 and 2 - Adopted.

Item 3A - The meaning of the word “amount” was questioned. This item was referred back to the workgroup for clarification.

Item 4 - Referred to the Evaluation Committee for further clarification and consideration.

- **Residential Services Workgroup** by Shelton Dent. Action items will be presented at the January meeting. He reported that the Request for Proposal (RFP) document is due back on November 29. (This RFP is for the purpose of contracting out development of a cost model for use in setting rates paid for residential services, as well as exploring the possibility of applying the same rate methodology to all of the service categories). A decision on the contractor will be made on December 3.
- **Respite Workgroup** by Mike Huckins. Action items will be addressed at the January meeting. Included in this discussion was a concern that the lack of crisis services issue has not been discussed and that possibly all of the workgroups could address this issue. It was pointed out that after the framework is completed, there will still be opportunities to add to the report.
- **Community Services and Supports Workgroup** by Cindy Burton. The action items were reviewed and revised as follows:

Item 1 - Delete the second sentence since it is included as a Service Standard.

Item 1 - A concern was expressed that “work opportunities” was not included in the Definition of Service. It was explained that this definition referred to the concept of services, rather than naming the numerous individual services. Input from the discussion will be considered at the Community Services and Supports Workgroup on November 19.

Item 2 and Items 3A and 3B - Adopted.

Item 3C - Deleting the word “current” was discussed and will be considered at the next meeting also.

Item 4 - The merits of accreditation were discussed.

- **Evaluation Committee** by John Moise. He expressed the fact that their committee’s progress was dependent on the workgroups completing their work and compiling it in a comprehensive understandable format. John indicated that a sixth goal in addition to the five goals contained in the committee’s report is under consideration by the committee.

[Note: Written copies of the workgroup reports presented were contained in the meeting packet received by Committee members.]

Next meeting is scheduled for January 18, 2000, at the Burbank Hilton.